arXiv:1509.00863v1 [math.AP] 2 Sep 2015

Carleman estimates for parabolic equations with interior degeneracy and Neumann boundary conditions

IDRISS BOUTAAYAMOU
Département de Mathématiques
Faculté des Sciences Semlalia
LMDP, UMMISCO (IRD-UPMC)
Université Cadi Ayyad,
Marrakech 40000, B.P. 2390, Morocco
email: dsboutaayamou@gmail.com
GENNI FRAGNELLI*
Dipartimento di Matematica
Università di Bari "Aldo Moro"
Via E. Orabona 4
70125 Bari - Italy
email: genni.fragnelli@uniba.it
LAHCEN MANIAR
Département de Mathématiques
Faculté des Sciences Semlalia
LMDP, UMMISCO (IRD-UPMC)
Université Cadi Ayyad,
Marrakech 40000, B.P. 2390, Morocco
email: maniar@uca.ma

Abstract

We consider a parabolic problem with degeneracy in the interior of the spatial domain and Neumann boundary conditions. In particular, we will focus on the well-posedness of the problem and on Carleman estimates for the associated adjoint problem. The novelty of the present paper is that for the first time it is considered a problem with an interior degeneracy and Neumann boundary conditions so that no previous result can be adapted to this situation. As a consequence new observability inequalities are established.

Keywords: degenerate equations, interior degeneracy, Carleman estimates, observability inequalities

MSC 2010: 35K65, 93B07

---

[*] The author is a member of the Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of the Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM) and she is partially supported by the reaserch project *Sistemi con operatori irregolari* of the GNAMPA-INdAM.

1 Introduction

The study of degenerate parabolic equations is the subject of numerous articles and books. Indeed many problems coming from physics, biology and economics are described by degenerate parabolic equations, whose linear prototype is

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - Au = h(t,x), \quad (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (0,1) \tag{1.1}$$

with the associated desired boundary conditions. Here $T > 0$ is given, h belongs to a suitable Lebesgue space and $Au = A_1u := (au_x)_x$ or $Au = A_2u := au_{xx}$, where a is a degenerate function.

In the present paper we will focus on a particular topic related to this field of research, i.e. Carleman estimates for the adjoint problem of the previous equation. Indeed, they have so many applications that a large number of papers has been devoted to prove some forms of them and possibly some applications. For example, it is well known that they are crucial for inverse problems (see, for example, [22]) and for unique continuation properties (see, for example, [21]). In particular, they are a fundamental tool to prove observability inequalities, which lead to global null controllability results for the Cauchy problem associated to (1.1) also in the non degenerate case (see, for instance, [1] - [3], [7] - [11], [14] - [19], [21], [23] and the references therein). For related systems of degenerate equations we refer, for example, to [1] and [2].

In most of the previous papers the authors assume that the function a degenerates at the boundary of the space domain, for example $a(x) = x^k(1-x)^\alpha$, $x \in [0,1]$, where k and α are positive constants, and the degeneracy is *regular* .The question of Carleman estimates for partial differential systems with non smooth coefficients, i.e. the coefficient a is not of class C^1 (or even with higher regularity, as sometimes it is required) is not fully solved yet. Indeed, the presence of a non smooth coefficient introduces several complications, and, in fact, the literature in this context is quite poor also in the non degenerate case (for more details see [19]). To our best knowledge, the first results on Carleman estimates for the adjoint problem of (1.1) with an interior degenerate point are obtained in [18], for a regular degeneracy, and in [19], for a globally non smooth degeneracy. We underline that in [18] and in [19] the authors consider the problem in divergence ([18], [19]) or in non divergence form ([19]) but only with *Dirichlet boundary conditions.* We also refer to [5], where an inverse source problem of a 2×2 cascade parabolic systems with interior degeneracy is studied. However, in all the previous papers the authors consider (1.1) only with *Dirichlet boundary conditions.* Neumann boundary conditions are considered in [3] and in [17], but again the degeneracy is at the boundary of the space domain.

The goal of this paper is to give a full analysis of (1.1) with *Neumann boundary conditions* in the case that the degeneracy occurs at the interior of the space domain; moreover, the coefficient is allowed to be *non smooth* in the non divergence case and in the strongly degenerate divergence case. In particular, we consider the following problem:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} - Au = h(t,x), & (t,x) \in Q_T, \\ u_x(t,0) = u_x(t,1) = 0, & t \geq 0, \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in (0,1), \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

where $Q_T := (0,T) \times (0,1)$, $Au := A_1u := (au_x)_x$ or $Au := A_2u := au_{xx}$, a degenerates at $x_0 \in (0,1)$, $u_0 \in X$ and $h \in L^2(0,T;X)$. Here X denotes the Hilbert space $L^2(0,1)$, in the divergence form, and $L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$, in the non divergence one (for the precise definition of $L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$ we refer to Section 3).

We give the following definitions:

Definition 1.1. The operators $A_1u := (au')'$ and $A_2u = au''$ are weakly degenerate if there exists $x_0 \in (0,1)$ such that $a(x_0) = 0$, $a > 0$ on $[0,1] \setminus \{x_0\}$, $a \in W^{1,1}(0,1)$ and there exists $K_1 \in (0,1)$ such that $(x - x_0)a' \le K_1 a$ a.e. in $[0,1]$.

Definition 1.2. The operators $A_1u := (au')'$ and $A_2u = au''$ are strongly degenerate if there exists $x_0 \in (0,1)$ such that $a(x_0) = 0$, $a > 0$ on $[0,1] \setminus \{x_0\}$, $a \in W^{1,\infty}(0,1)$ and there exists $K_2 \in [1,2)$ such that $(x - x_0)a' \le K_2 a$ a.e. in $[0,1]$.

Typical examples for weak and strong degeneracies are $a(x) = |x - x_0|^\alpha,\ 0 < \alpha < 1$ and $a(x) = |x - x_0|^\alpha,\ 1 \le \alpha < 2$, respectively.

The object of this paper is twofold: first we analyze the well-posedness of the problem with *Neumann boundary conditions*; second we prove Carleman estimates. To this aim we have a new approach: first, we use a reflection procedure and then we employ the Carleman estimates for the analogue of (1.2) with Dirichlet boundary conditions proved in [19]. Finally, as a consequence of the Carleman estimates we prove, using again a reflection procedure, observability inequalities. In particular, we prove that there exists a positive constant C_T such that every solution v of

$$\begin{cases} v_t + Av = 0, & (t,x) \in Q_T, \\ v_x(t,0) = v_x(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ v(T,x) = v_T(x) \in X, \end{cases}$$

satisfies, under suitable assumptions, the following estimate:

$$\|v(0)\|_X^2 \le C_T \|v\chi_\omega\|^2_{L^2(0,T;X)}. \tag{1.3}$$

Here χ_ω is the characteristic function of the control region ω which is assumed to be an interval which contains the degeneracy point or an interval lying on one side of the degeneracy point. As an immediate consequence, we can prove, using a standard technique (e.g., see [21, Section 7.4]), the null controllability result for the linear degenerate problem: if (1.3) holds, then for every $u_0 \in X$ there exists $h \in L^2(0,T;X)$ such that the solution u of

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} - Au = h(t,x)\chi_\omega(x), & (t,x) \in Q_T, \\ u_x(t,0) = u_x(t,1) = 0, & t \ge 0, \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in (0,1), \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

is such that $u(T,x) = 0$ for every $x \in [0,1]$; moreover $\|h\|^2_{L^2(0,T;X)} \le C\|u_0\|^2_X$, for some universal positive constant C.

We conclude this introduction underlining the fact that in the present paper we consider equations *in divergence* and *in non divergence form*, since the last one *cannot* be recast in divergence form: for example, the simple equation $u_t = a(x)u_{xx}$ can be written in divergence form as $u_t = (a(x)u_x)_x - a'u_x$, only if a' does exist; in addition, as far as well-posedness is considered for the last equation, additional conditions are necessary. For instance, for the prototype $a(x) = |x - x_0|^K$ well-posedness is guaranteed if $K \ge 2$. However, in [19] the authors prove that if $a(x) = |x - x_0|^K$ the global null controllability fails exactly when $K \ge 2$.

The paper is organized as follows: in Sections 2 and 3 we study the well-posedness of the problem and we characterize the domain of the operator in some cases. In Sections 4 and 5 we prove Carleman estimates for the problem in divergence and in non divergence form. As a consequence, in Section 6, we prove observability inequalities and we conclude the paper with some comments on Carleman estimates.

A final comment on the notation: by C and C_T we shall denote universal positive constants, which are allowed to vary from line to line and depend only on the coefficients of the equation.

2 Well posedness in the divergence case

In this section we consider the operator in divergence form, that is $A_1u = (au')'$, and we distinguish, as usual, two cases: the weakly degenerate case and the strongly degenerate one.

2.1 Weakly degenerate operator

Throughout this subsection we assume that the operator is weakly degenerate.
In order to prove that A_1, with a suitable domain, generates a strongly continuous semigroup, we introduce, as in [3] or [20], the following weighted spaces:

$$H^1_a(0,1) := \{u \text{ is absolutely continuous in } [0,1] \text{ and } \sqrt{a}u' \in L^2(0,1)\}$$

with the norm

$$\|u\|^2_{H^1_a(0,1)} := \|u\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} + \|\sqrt{a}u'\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} \tag{2.1}$$

and $H^2_a(0,1) := \{u \in H^1_a(0,1) |\, au' \in H^1(0,1)\}$ with

$$\|u\|^2_{H^2_a(0,1)} := \|u\|^2_{H^1_a(0,1)} + \|(au')'\|^2_{L^2(0,1)}. \tag{2.2}$$

Then, define the operator A_1 by $D(A_1) = \{u \in H^2_a(0,1) |\, u'(0) = u'(1) = 0\}$, and, for any $u \in D(A_1)$, $A_1u := (au')'$. As in [20, Lemma 2.1], using the fact that $u'(0) = u'(1) = 0$ for all $u \in D(A_1)$, one can prove the following formula of integration by parts:

Lemma 2.1. *For all $(u, v) \in D(A_1) \times H^1_a(0,1)$ one has*

$$\int_0^1 (au')'v dx = -\int_0^1 au'v' dx. \tag{2.3}$$

Now, let us go back to problem (1.2), recalling the following

Definition 2.1. If $u_0 \in L^2(0,1)$ and $h \in L^2(Q_T) := L^2(0,T; L^2(0,1))$, a function u is said to be a weak solution of (1.2) with $A = A_1$ if

$$u \in C([0,T]; L^2(0,1)) \cap L^2(0,T; H^1_a(0,1))$$

and

$$\int_0^1 u(T,x)\varphi(T,x)\, dx - \int_0^1 u_0(x)\varphi(0,x)\, dx - \int_{Q_T} u\varphi_t\, dxdt = \\ -\int_{Q_T} au_x\varphi_x\, dxdt + \int_{Q_T} h\varphi\, dxdt$$

for all $\varphi \in H^1(0,T; L^2(0,1)) \cap L^2(0,T; H^1_a(0,1))$.

Hence, the next result holds.

Theorem 2.1. *The operator $A_1 : D(A_1) \to L^2(0,1)$ is self–adjoint, nonpositive on $L^2(0,1)$ and it generates an analytic contraction semigroup of angle $\pi/2$. Therefore, for all $h \in L^2(Q_T)$ and $u_0 \in L^2(0,1)$, there exists a unique solution*

$$u \in C\big([0,T]; L^2(0,1)\big) \cap L^2\big(0,T; H^1_a(0,1)\big)$$

of (1.2) *such that*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|u(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)}+\int_0^T\|u(t)\|^2_{H^1_a(0,1)}dt\le C_T\left(\|u_0\|^2_{L^2(0,1)}+\|h\|^2_{L^2(Q_T)}\right), \tag{2.4}$$

for some positive constant C_T*. Moreover, if* $h\in W^{1,1}(0,T;L^2(0,1))$ *and* $u_0\in H^1_a(0,1)$*, then*

$$u\in C^1\big([0,T];L^2(0,1)\big)\cap C\big([0,T];D(A_1)\big), \tag{2.5}$$

and there exists a positive constant C *such that*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left(\|u(t)\|^2_{H^1_a(0,1)}\right)+\int_0^T\left(\|u_t\|^2_{L^2(0,1)}+\|(au_x)_x\|^2_{L^2(0,1)}\right)dt\\&\le C\left(\|u_0\|^2_{H^1_a(0,1)}+\|h\|^2_{L^2(Q_T)}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Proof. Observe that $D(A_1)$ is dense in $L^2(0,1)$. In order to show that A_1 is nonpositive and self-adjoint it suffices to prove that A_1 is symmetric, nonpositive and $(I-A_1)(D(A_1))=L^2(0,1)$. Following [20], one can prove that A_1 is symmetric and nonpositive. Now, we prove that $I-A_1$ is surjective, since the proof is quite different.

First of all, observe that $H^1_a(0,1)$ equipped with the inner product $(u,v)_1:=\int_0^1(uv+au'v')dx$, for any $u,v\in H^1_a(0,1)$, is a Hilbert space. Moreover, $H^1_a(0,1)\hookrightarrow L^2(0,1)\hookrightarrow(H^1_a(0,1))^*$, where $(H^1_a(0,1))^*$ is the dual space of $H^1_a(0,1)$ with respect to $L^2(0,1)$. Now, for $f\in L^2(0,1)$, consider the functional $F:H^1_a(0,1)\to\mathbb{R}$ defined as $F(v):=\displaystyle\int_0^1 fvdx$. Clearly, it belongs to $(H^1_a(0,1))^*$. As a consequence, by the Lax–Milgram Lemma, there exists a unique $u\in H^1_a(0,1)$ such that for all $v\in H^1_a(0,1)$ $(u,v)_1=\int_0^1 fvdx$. In particular, since $C^\infty_c(0,1)\subset H^1_a(0,1)$, the previous equality holds for all $v\in C^\infty_c(0,1)$, i.e. $\int_0^1 au'v'dx=\int_0^1(f-u)vdx$, for all $v\in C^\infty_c(0,1)$. Thus, the distributional derivative of au' is a function in $L^2(0,1)$, that is $au'\in H^1(0,1)$ (recall that $\sqrt{a}u'\in L^2(0,1)$) and $(au')'=u-f$ a.e. in $(0,1)$. Then $u\in H^2_a(0,1)$ and, proceeding as in [6, Proposition VIII.16], one can prove that $u'(0)=u'(1)=0$. In fact, by the Gauss Green Identity and $(u,v)_1=\int_0^1 fvdx$, one has that for all $v\in H^1_a(0,1)$

$$\int_0^1(au')'vdx=[au'v]^{x=1}_{x=0}-\int_0^1 au'v'dx=[au'v]^{x=1}_{x=0}-\int_0^1(f-u)vdx. \tag{2.7}$$

In particular, the previous equality holds for all $v\in C^\infty_c(0,1)$. Thus, $[au'v]^{x=1}_{x=0}=0$ for all $v\in C^\infty_c(0,1)$ and $(au')'=u-f$ a. e. in $(0,1)$. Coming back to (2.7), it becomes $[au'v]^{x=1}_{x=0}=0$, for all $v\in H^1_a(0,1)$. Since $v(0)$ and $v(1)$ are arbitrary and a does not degenerate in 0 and in 1, one can conclude that $u'(0)=u'(1)=0$.
Hence $u\in D(A_1)$, and by $(u,v)_1=\int_0^1 fvdx$ and Lemma 2.1, we have $\int_0^1(u-(au')'-f)vdx=0$. Consequently, $u\in D(A_1)$ and $u-A_1u=f$.

Finally, A_1 being a nonpositive self–adjoint operator on a Hilbert space, it is well known that $(A_1,D(A_1))$ generates a cosine family and an analytic contractive semigroup of angle $\frac{\pi}{2}$ on $L^2(0,1)$ (see, e.g., [20])).

In the rest of the proof, following [19, Theorem 2.1], we will prove (2.4)–(2.6). First, being A_1 the generator of a strongly continuous semigroup on $L^2(0,1)$, if $u_0\in L^2(0,1)$, then the solution u of (1.2) belongs to $C\big([0,T];L^2(0,1)\big)\cap L^2\big(0,T;H^1_a(0,1)\big)$, while, if $u_0\in D(A_1)$ and $h\in W^{1,1}(0,T;L^2(0,1))$, then $u\in C^1\big([0,T];L^2(0,1)\big)\cap C\big([0,T];H^2_a(0,1)\big)$ by [4, Proposition3.3] and [12, Lemma 4.1.5 and Proposition 4.1.6].

Now, we shall prove (2.4) – (2.6). First, take $u_0 \in D(A_1)$ and multiply the equation of (1.2) by u; by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality we obtain for every $t \in (0, T]$,

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|u(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} + \|\sqrt{a}u_x(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} \leq \frac{1}{2}\|u(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} + \frac{1}{2}\|h(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)}, \tag{2.8}$$

from which

$$\|u(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} \leq e^T \left(\|u(0)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} + \|h\|^2_{L^2(Q_T)}\right) \tag{2.9}$$

for every $t \leq T$. From (2.8) and (2.9) we immediately get

$$\int_0^T \|\sqrt{a}u_x(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)}dt \leq C_T \left(\|u(0)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} + \|h\|^2_{L^2(Q_T)}\right) \tag{2.10}$$

for every $t \leq T$ and some universal constant $C_T > 0$. Thus, by (2.9) and (2.10), (2.4) follows if $u_0 \in D(A_1)$. Since $D(A_1)$ is dense in $L^2(0,1)$, the same inequality holds if $u_0 \in L^2(0,1)$.

Now, we multiply the equation by $-(au_x)_x$, we integrate on $(0,1)$ and we easily get $\frac{d}{dt}\|\sqrt{a}u_x(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} + \|(au_x)_x(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} \leq \|h(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)}$ for every t, so that, as before, we find $C'_T > 0$ such that

$$\|\sqrt{a}u_x(t)\|_{L^2(0,1)} + \int_0^T \|(au_x)_x(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)}dt \leq C'_T \left(\|\sqrt{a}u_x(0)\|_{L^2(0,1)} + \|h\|^2_{L^2(Q_T)}\right) \tag{2.11}$$

for every $t \leq T$. Finally, from $u_t = (au_x)_x + h$, squaring and integrating, we find $\int_0^T \|u_t(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} \leq C\left(\int_0^T \|(au_x)_x\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} + \|h\|^2_{L^2(Q_T)}\right)$, and together with (2.11) we find

$$\int_0^T \|u_t(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} \leq C\left(\|\sqrt{a}u_x(0)\|_{L^2(0,1)} + \|h\|^2_{L^2(Q_T)}\right). \tag{2.12}$$

In conclusion, (2.8), (2.9), (2.11) and (2.12) give (2.4) and (2.6). Clearly, (2.5) and (2.6) hold also if $u_0 \in H^1_a(0,1)$, since $D(A_1)$ is dense in $H^1_a(0,1)$. □

2.2 Strongly degenerate operator

In this subsection we assume that the operator is strongly degenerate. Following [3], we introduce the weighted space

$$\begin{aligned} H^1_a(0,1) := \{u \in L^2(0,1) \ \mid & u \text{ locally absolutely continuous in } [0,x_0) \cup (x_0,1] \\ & \text{and } \sqrt{a}u' \in L^2(0,1)\} \end{aligned}$$

with the norm given in (2.1). Define the operator A_1 by $D(A_1) = \{u \in H^2_a(0,1) \mid u'(0) = u'(1) = 0\}$, and, for any $u \in D(A_1)$, $A_1 u := (au')'$, where $(H^2_a(0,1), \|\cdot\|_{H^2_a(0,1)})$ is defined as before. Since in this case a function $u \in H^2_a(0,1)$ is locally absolutely continuous in $[0,1] \setminus \{x_0\}$ and not necessarily absolutely continuous in $[0,1]$ as for the weakly degenerate case, equality (2.3) is not true a priori. Thus, as in [20], we have to prove again the formula of integration by parts. To do this, an idea is to characterize the domain of A_1. The next results hold:

Proposition 2.1. *Let*

$$\begin{aligned} X := \{u \in L^2(0,1) \mid & \ u \textit{ locally absolutely continuous in } [0,1] \setminus \{x_0\}, \\ & \sqrt{a}u' \in L^2(0,1), au \textit{ is continuous at } x_0 \textit{ and } (au)(x_0) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $H^1_a(0,1) = X$.

Proof. Obviously, $X \subseteq H^1_a$. Now we take $u \in H^1_a$ and we prove that au is continuous at x_0 and $(au)(x_0) = 0$, that is $u \in X$. Toward this end, observe that since $a \in W^{1,\infty}(0,1)$, $(au)' = a'u + au' \in L^2(0,1)$. Thus, for $x < x_0$, one has $au(x) = (au)(0) + \int_0^x (au)'(t)dt$ (observe that $(au)(0) \in \mathbb{R}$). This implies that there exists $\lim_{x\to x_0^-}(au)(x) = (au)(x_0) = (au)(0) + \int_0^{x_0}(au)'(t)dt = L \in \mathbb{R}$. As in [20, Proposition 2.3], one can prove that $L = 0$. Analogously, $\lim_{x\to x_0^+}(au)(x) = (au)(x_0) = 0$. Thus $(au)(x_0) = 0$. □

Using the previous result, one can prove the following characterization:

Proposition 2.2. *Let*

$$\begin{aligned} D := \{u \in L^2(0,1) \mid\, & u \textit{ locally absolutely continuous in } [0,1]\setminus\{x_0\}, au \in H^1(0,1),\\ & au' \in H^1(0,1), au \textit{ is continuous at } x_0\\ & \textit{and } (au)(x_0) = (au')(x_0) = u'(0) = u'(1) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $D(A_1) = D$.

Proof. Let us prove that $D = D(A_1)$.
$\boldsymbol{D \subseteq D(A_1)}$ **:** It is a simple adaptation of the proof of [20, Proposition 2.4] to which we refer. We underline the fact that here we use the boundary conditions $u'(0) = u'(1) = 0$.
$\boldsymbol{D(A_1) \subseteq D}$ **:** As in the proof of Proposition 2.1, we can prove that $au, (au)' \in L^2(0,1)$, thus $au \in H^1(0,1)$. Moreover, by Proposition 2.1, $(au)(x_0) = 0$. Thus, it is sufficient to prove that $(au')(x_0) = 0$. This follows as in [20, Proposition 2.4]. □

We point out the fact that to prove the previous characterization the condition $\dfrac{1}{a} \notin L^1(0,1)$ is crucial. Clearly this condition is not satisfied if the operator is weakly degenerate. Indeed, in [18, Lemma 2.1] it is proved that if the operator is weakly degenerate, then $\dfrac{1}{a} \in L^1(0,1)$; on the other hand, if it is strongly degenerate then $\dfrac{1}{\sqrt{a}} \in L^1(0,1)$, while $\dfrac{1}{a} \notin L^1(0,1)$.

Proceeding as in [20, Lemma 2.6] and using the previous characterization, we can prove the formula of integration by parts (2.3) also in the strongly degenerate case. Thus, the analogue of Theorem 2.1 holds.

3 Well posedness in the non divergence case

Now, we consider the operator $A_2u = au''$ in the weakly and in the strongly degenerate cases and, as in [19, Chapter 2], we consider the following Hilbert spaces:

$$L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) := \left\{u \in L^2(0,1) \;\mid\; \int_0^1 \frac{u^2}{a}dx < \infty\right\},$$

$$H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) := L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) \cap H^1(0,1) \quad \text{and} \quad H^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) := \left\{u \in H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) \,\middle|\, u' \in H^1(0,1)\right\},$$

endowed with the associated norms $\|u\|^2_{L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)} := \displaystyle\int_0^1 \frac{u^2}{a}dx$, $\forall\, u \in L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$, $\|u\|^2_{H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}} := \|u\|^2_{L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)} + \|u'\|^2_{L^2(0,1)}$, $\forall\, u \in H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$ and $\|u\|^2_{H^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)} := \|u\|^2_{H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)} + \|au''\|^2_{L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)}$, $\forall\, u \in$

$H^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$, respectively. Indeed, it is a trivial fact that, if $u' \in H^1(0,1)$, then $au'' \in L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$, so that the norm for $H^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$ is well defined and we can also write in a more appealing way

$$H^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) := \Big\{u \in H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) \,\big|\, u' \in H^1(0,1) \text{ and } au'' \in L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)\Big\}.$$

Using the previous spaces, we define the operator A_2 by $D(A_2) = \{u \in H^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) |\, u'(0) = u'(1) = 0\}$ and, for any $u \in D(A_2)$, $A_2 u := au''$.

Proceeding as in [20, Corollary 3.1], one can prove the following characterization:

Corollary 3.1. *If the operator is weakly degenerate, then the spaces* $H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$ *and* $H^1(0,1)$ *coincide algebraically. Moreover the two norms are equivalent.*

Hence in the weakly case $C^\infty_c(0,1)$ is dense in $H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$.

As for the divergence form, a crucial tool is the following formula of integration by parts:

Lemma 3.1. *For all* $(u,v) \in D(A_2) \times H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$ *one has*

$$\int_0^1 u''v\,dx = -\int_0^1 u'v'\,dx. \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. It is trivial, since $u'(0)$=$u'(1)$=0 and both $u' \in H^1(0,1)$ and $v \in H^1(0,1)$. □

We also recall the following definition:

Definition 3.1. Assume that $u_0 \in L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$ and $h \in L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(Q_T) := L^2(0,T; L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1))$. A function u is said to be a weak solution of (1.2) with $A = A_2$ if

$$u \in C([0,T]; L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)) \cap L^2(0,T; H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1))$$

and satisfies

$$\int_0^1 \frac{u(T,x)\varphi(T,x)}{a(x)}dx - \int_0^1 \frac{u_0(x)\varphi(0,x)}{a(x)}dx - \int_{Q_T} \frac{\varphi_t(t,x)u(t,x)}{a(x)}dxdt =$$
$$-\int_{Q_T} u_x(t,x)\varphi_x(t,x)dxdt + \int_{Q_T} h(t,x)\frac{\varphi(t,x)}{a(x)}dxdt$$

for all $\varphi \in H^1(0,T; L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)) \cap L^2(0,T; H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1))$.

As a consequence of the previous lemma one has the next proposition, whose proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 3.1. *The operator* $A_2 : D(A_2) \to L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$ *is self–adjoint, nonpositive on* $L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$ *and it generates an analytic contraction semigroup of angle* $\pi/2$*. Therefore, for all* $h \in L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(Q_T)$ *and* $u_0 \in L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$*, there exists a unique solution*

$$u \in C\big([0,T]; L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)\big) \cap L^2\big(0,T; H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)\big)$$

of (1.2) *such that*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|u(t)\|^2_{L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)} + \int_0^T \|u(t)\|^2_{H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)}dt \le C_T \left(\|u_0\|^2_{L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)} + \|h\|^2_{L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(Q_T)}\right), \tag{3.2}$$

for some positive constant C_T. Moreover, if $h \in W^{1,1}(0,T;L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1))$ and $u_0 \in H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$, then

$$u \in C^1\big([0,T];L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)\big) \cap C\big([0,T];D(A_2)\big), \tag{3.3}$$

and there exists a positive constant C such that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\left(\|u(t)\|^2_{H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)}\right)+\int_0^T\left(\|u_t\|^2_{L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)}+\|au_{xx}\|^2_{L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)}\right)dt\\ \le C\left(\|u_0\|^2_{H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)}+\|h\|^2_{L^2(Q_T)}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. In the (SD) case for the existence and the regularity parts, we can proceed as in [19, Theorem 2.2], to which we refer. In the (WD) case, we proceed as in Theorem 2.1: first, observe that $D(A_2)$ is dense in $L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$. Then, using Lemma 3.1, one has that A_2 is symmetric and nonpositive. Finally, let us show that $I-A_2$ is surjective. First of all, observe that $H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$ is equipped with the natural inner product $(u,v)_1 := \displaystyle\int_0^1\left(\frac{uv}{a}+u'v'\right)dx$ for any $u,v \in H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$. Moreover, it is clear that $H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) \hookrightarrow L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) \hookrightarrow (H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1))^*$, where $(H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1))^*$ is the dual space of $H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$ with respect to $L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$. Now, if $f \in L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$, consider the functional $F : H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) \to \mathbb{R}$ defined as $F(v) := \displaystyle\int_0^1 \frac{fv}{a}dx$. Clearly it belongs to $(H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1))^*$. As a consequence, by the Lax–Milgram Lemma, there exists a unique $u \in H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$ such that for all $v \in H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$, $(u,v)_1 = \displaystyle\int_0^1\frac{fv}{a}dx$. In particular, since $C^\infty_c(0,1) \subset H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$, the previous equality holds for all $v \in C^\infty_c(0,1)$, i.e. $\displaystyle\int_0^1 u'v'dx = \int_0^1\frac{(f-u)}{a}v\,dx$, for every $v \in C^\infty_c(0,1)$. Thus, the distributional derivative of u' is a function in $L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) \subset L^2(0,1)$, hence it is easy to see that $au'' \in L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$. Thus $u \in H^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$. Proceeding as in Theorem 2.1, one can prove that $u'(0)=u'(1)=0$. In fact, by the Gauss Green Identity and $(u,v)_1 = \displaystyle\int_0^1\frac{fv}{a}dx$, one has that for all $v \in H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$,

$$\int_0^1 u''vdx = [u'v]^{x=1}_{x=0} - \int_0^1 u'v'dx = [u'v]^{x=1}_{x=0} - \int_0^1\frac{(f-u)}{a}vdx. \tag{3.5}$$

In particular, the previous equality holds for all $v \in C^\infty_c(0,1)$. Thus, $[u'v]^{x=1}_{x=0} = 0$ for all $v \in C^\infty_c(0,1)$ and $u'' = \dfrac{(u-f)}{a}$ a. e. in $(0,1)$. Coming back to (3.5), it becomes $[u'v]^{x=1}_{x=0} = 0$, for all $v \in H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$. Again, one can conclude that $u'(0)=u'(1)=0$. Thus $u \in D(A_2)$, and by $(u,v)_1 = \displaystyle\int_0^1\frac{fv}{a}dx$ and Lemma 3.1, we have $\displaystyle\int_0^1\left(\frac{u-f}{a}-u''\right)vdx = 0$. Consequently, $u \in D(A_2)$ and $u - A_2u = f$. As in Theorem 2.1, one can conclude that $(A_2, D(A_2))$ generates a cosine family and an analytic contractive semigroup of angle $\dfrac{\pi}{2}$ on $L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$. The rest of the theorem follows as in [19, Theorem 2.2]. □

3.1 Characterizations in the strongly degenerate case

In this subsection we will concentrate, as in [20], on the strongly degenerate case and we will characterize the spaces $H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$ and $H^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$. We point out the fact that in non divergence form, the characterization of the domain of the operator is not important to prove the formula of integration by parts as in divergence form.

First of all observe that, as in [18, Lemma 2.1], one can prove that $\dfrac{|x-x_0|^2}{a(x)} \le C$, for all $x \in [0,1]\setminus\{x_0\}$, where $C := \max\left\{\dfrac{(x_0)^2}{a(0)}, \dfrac{(1-x_0)^2}{a(1)}\right\}$. The following characterization holds:

Proposition 3.1. *Let* $X := \{u \in H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) \ \mid u(x_0) = 0\}$. *If* A_2 *is strongly degenerate, then* $H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) = X$ *and, for all* $u \in X$, $\|u\|_{H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)}$ *is equivalent to* $\left(\int_0^1 (u')^2 dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

The proof of the previous proposition is a simple adaptation of the proof of [20, Proposition 3.6], to which we refer. An immediate consequence of Proposition 3.1 is the following result.

Proposition 3.2. *Let*

$$D := \{u \in H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) \ \mid \ au'' \in L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1),\ u' \in H^1(0,1) \text{ and } u(x_0) = (au')(x_0) = 0\}.$$

If A_2 *is strongly degenerate, then* $H^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) = D$.

Proof. Obviously, $D \subseteq H^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$. Now, we take $u \in H^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$ and we prove that $u \in D$. By Proposition 3.1, $u(x_0) = 0$. Thus, it is sufficient to prove that $(au')(x_0) = 0$. Since $u' \in H^1(0,1)$ and $a \in W^{1,\infty}(0,1)$, then $au' \in C[0,1]$ and $\sqrt{a}u' \in L^2(0,1)$. This implies that there exists $\lim_{x\to x_0}(au')(x) = (au')(x_0) = L \in \mathbb{R}$. Proceeding as in the proof of [20, Proposition 3.6], one can prove that $L = 0$, that is $(au')(x_0) = 0$. $\square$

4 Carleman estimate for degenerate parabolic problems: the divergence case

In this section we prove an interesting estimate of Carleman type for the adjoint problem of (1.2) in divergence form

$$\begin{cases} v_t + (av_x)_x = h, & (t,x) \in Q_T, \\ v_x(t,0) = v_x(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ v(T,x) = v_T(x) \in L^2(0,1), \end{cases}$$

where $T > 0$ is given. As it is well known, to prove Carleman estimates the final datum is irrelevant, only the equation and the boundary conditions are important. For this reason we can consider only the problem

$$\begin{cases} v_t + (av_x)_x = h, & (t,x) \in Q_T, \\ v_x(t,0) = v_x(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T). \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

Here we assume that $h \in L^2(Q_T)$ and on a we make the following assumptions:

Hypothesis 4.1. The function a is such that

1. the operator A_1 is weakly or strongly degenerate;
2. in the weakly degenerate case $a \in W^{1,1}(0,1) \cap C^1\big([0,1]\setminus\{x_0\}\big)$, in the strongly degenerate one $a \in W^{1,\infty}(0,1)$;

3. if A_1 is strongly degenerate and $K > \dfrac{4}{3}$, then there exists a constant $\vartheta \in (0, K]$ such that the function

$$x \mapsto \frac{a(x)}{|x-x_0|^{\vartheta}} \quad \begin{cases} \text{is nonincreasing on the left of } x = x_0, \\ \text{is nondecreasing on the right of } x = x_0. \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

In addition, when $K > \dfrac{3}{2}$, the previous map is bounded below away from 0 and there exists a constant $\Sigma > 0$ such that $|a'(x)| \leq \Sigma |x - x_0|^{2\vartheta - 3}$ for a.e. $x \in [0, 1]$.

Here K is the constant that appears in Definition 1.2.

Remark 1. The additional requirements when $K > 3/2$ are technical ones and are introduced in [19, Hypothesis 4.1] to guarantee the convergence of some integrals for this sub-case (see [19, Appendix]). Of course, the prototype $a(x) = |x - x_0|^K$ satisfies such a condition with $\vartheta = K$.

As in [18] or in [19, Chapter 4], let us introduce the function $\varphi(t, x) := \Theta(t)\psi(x)$, where

$$\Theta(t) := \frac{1}{[t(T-t)]^4} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi(x) := c_1 \left[\int_{x_0}^{x} \frac{y - x_0}{a(y)} dy - c_2 \right], \tag{4.3}$$

with $c_2 > \max\left\{ \dfrac{(1-x_0)^2}{a(1)(2-K)}, \dfrac{x_0^2}{a(0)(2-K)} \right\}$ and $c_1 > 0$. Observe that $\Theta(t) \to +\infty$ as $t \to 0^+, T^-$ and by [18, Lemma 2.1], we have that $-c_1c_2 \leq \psi(x) < 0$. Our main result is thus the following:

Theorem 4.1. *Assume Hypothesis* 4.1. *Then, there exist two positive constants C and s_0, such that every solution v of* (4.1) *in $\mathcal{V} := L^2\big(0, T; D(A_1)\big) \cap H^1\big(0, T; H^1_a(0, 1)\big)$ satisfies, for all $s \geq s_0$,*

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 \left(s\Theta a(v_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2 \right) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \leq C \int_0^T \int_0^1 (h^2 + v^2) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt. \tag{4.4}$$

Moreover, if ω is a strict subset of $(0, 1)$ *such that $x_0 \in \omega$, then* (4.4) *becomes*

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \int_0^1 \left(s\Theta a(v_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2 \right) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\ &\leq C \left(\int_0^T \int_0^1 h^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \right). \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

Remark 2. Observe that an inequality analogous to (4.4) in the non degenerate case is proved in [21], where the authors show that

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 \left(s\Theta(v_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 v^2 \right) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \leq C \left(\int_0^T \int_0^1 h^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + s^3 \int_0^T \int_\omega \Theta^3 v^2 e^{2s\varphi} \right), \tag{4.6}$$

for a different weight function φ and for a fixed subset ω compactly contained in $(0, 1)$. We underline that we don't have such a subset ω, but we don't have $s^3\Theta^3$ in the term $\int_0^T \int_0^1 v^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt$. However, such an integral cannot be estimated by

$$s^3 \int_0^T \int_0^1 \Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt$$

due to the degeneracy term, and so (4.4) is a good alternative of (4.6).

In order to prove the previous theorem the following Carleman estimate given in [19, Theorem 4.1] is crucial:

Theorem 4.2. *Assume Hypothesis* 4.1. *Then, there exist two positive constants C and s_0 such that every solution $v \in L^2\big(0,T;\mathcal{H}^2_a(0,1)\big) \cap H^1\big(0,T;\mathcal{H}^1_a(0,1)\big)$ of*

$$\begin{cases} v_t + (av_x)_x = h, & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (0,1), \\ v(t,0) = v(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T) \end{cases}$$

satisfies, for all $s \geq s_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{Q_T} \left(s\Theta a(v_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2 \right) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\ &\leq C \left(\int_{Q_T} h^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + sc_1 \int_0^T \big[a\Theta e^{2s\varphi}(x-x_0)(v_x)^2 dt \big]_{x=0}^{x=1} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where c_1 is the constant introduced in (4.3). *Here*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^1_a(0,1) := \big\{ &u \text{ is absolutely continuous in } [0,1], \\ &\sqrt{a}u' \in L^2(0,1) \text{ and } u(0) = u(1) = 0 \big\}, \end{aligned}$$

in the weakly degenerate case and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^1_a(0,1) := \big\{ u \in L^2(0,1) \;\; | \, &u \text{ locally absolutely continuous in } [0,x_0) \cup (x_0,1], \\ &\sqrt{a}u' \in L^2(0,1) \text{ and } u(0) = u(1) = 0 \big\} \end{aligned}$$

in the strong one. In any case

$$\mathcal{H}^2_a(0,1) := \big\{ u \in \mathcal{H}^1_a(0,1) | \, au' \in H^1(0,1) \big\}.$$

We underline the fact that in [19] the previous theorem is proved in the weakly degenerate case under the weaker assumption $a \in W^{1,1}(0,1)$.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. To prove the statement we use a technique based on cut off functions. To this aim, since $x_0 \in (0,1)$, we choose $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that $\alpha < \beta < x_0$, $1 + \beta < 2 - x_0$, and consider a smooth function $\xi : [-1,2] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\xi \equiv 1$ in $[-\alpha, 1+\alpha]$ and $\xi \equiv 0$ in $[-1,-\beta] \cup [1+\beta, 2]$. Now, we consider

$$W(t,x) := \begin{cases} v(t,2-x), & x \in [1,2], \\ v(t,x), & x \in [0,1], \\ v(t,-x), & x \in [-1,0], \end{cases} \tag{4.7}$$

where v solves (4.1). Thus W satisfies the following problem

$$\begin{cases} W_t + (\tilde{a}W_x)_x = \tilde{h}, & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (-1,2), \\ W_x(t,-1) = W_x(t,2) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \end{cases} \tag{4.8}$$

being

$$\tilde{a}(x) := \begin{cases} a(2-x), & x \in [1,2], \\ a(x), & x \in [0,1], \\ a(-x), & x \in [-1,0] \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{h}(t,x) := \begin{cases} h(t,2-x), & x \in [1,2], \\ h(t,x), & x \in [0,1], \\ h(t,-x), & x \in [-1,0]. \end{cases} \tag{4.9}$$

Observe that $\tilde{a}$ belongs to $W^{1,1}(-1,2)$ in the weakly degenerate case and to $W^{1,\infty}(-1,2)$ in the strongly degenerate one. Now, set $Z := \xi W$ and take $\delta > 0$ such that $\beta + \delta < x_0$ and $1 + \beta + \delta < 2 - x_0$. Clearly, $-x_0 < -\beta - \delta$. Then Z solves

$$\begin{cases} Z_t + (\tilde{a} Z_x)_x = H, & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (-\beta - \delta, 1 + \beta + \delta), \\ Z(t, -\beta - \delta) = Z(t, 1 + \beta + \delta) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \end{cases}$$

with $H := \xi \tilde{h} + (\tilde{a} \xi_x W)_x + \tilde{a} \xi_x W_x$. Observe that $Z_x(t, -\beta - \delta) = Z_x(t, 1 + \beta + \delta) = 0$ and, by the assumption on a and the fact that ξ_x is supported in $[-\beta, -\alpha] \cup [1 + \alpha, 1 + \beta]$, $H \in L^2((0,T) \times (-\beta - \delta, 1 + \beta + \delta))$. Now, define $\tilde{\varphi}(t,x) := \Theta(t) \tilde{\psi}(x)$, where

$$\tilde{\psi}(x) := \begin{cases} \psi(2-x) = c_1 \left[\displaystyle\int_{2-x_0}^{x} \frac{t - 2 + x_0}{\tilde{a}(t)} dt - c_2 \right], & x \in [1,2], \\ \psi(x), & x \in [0,1], \\ \psi(-x) = c_1 \left[\displaystyle\int_{-x_0}^{x} \frac{t + x_0}{\tilde{a}(t)} dt - c_2 \right], & x \in [-1,0]. \end{cases} \tag{4.10}$$

Thus, we can apply the analogue of Theorem 4.2 on $(-\beta - \delta, 1 + \beta + \delta)$ in place of $(0,1)$ and with weight $\tilde{\varphi}$, obtaining that there exist two positive constants C and s_0 (s_0 sufficiently large), such that Z satisfies, for all $s \geq s_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \int_{-\beta-\delta}^{1+\beta+\delta} \left(s\Theta \tilde{a} (Z_x)^2 + s^3 \Theta^3 \frac{(x - x_0)^2}{\tilde{a}} Z^2 \right) e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}} dxdt \\ &\leq C \left(\int_0^T \int_{-\beta-\delta}^{1+\beta+\delta} H^2 e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}} dxdt + sc_1 \int_0^T \left[\tilde{a} \Theta e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}} (x - x_0)(Z_x)^2 dt \right]_{x=-\beta-\delta}^{x=1+\beta+\delta} \right) \\ &= C \int_0^T \int_{-\beta-\delta}^{1+\beta+\delta} H^2 e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}} dxdt. \end{aligned}$$

By definition of ξ, W and Z, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \int_0^1 \left(s\Theta a (v_x)^2 + s^3 \Theta^3 \frac{(x - x_0)^2}{a} v^2 \right) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_0^1 \left(s\Theta a (Z_x)^2 + s^3 \Theta^3 \frac{(x - x_0)^2}{a} Z^2 \right) e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}} dxdt \\ &\leq \int_0^T \int_{-\beta-\delta}^{1+\beta+\delta} \left(s\Theta \tilde{a} (Z_x)^2 + s^3 \Theta^3 \frac{(x - x_0)^2}{\tilde{a}} Z^2 \right) e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}} dxdt \leq C \int_0^T \int_{-\beta-\delta}^{1+\beta+\delta} H^2 e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}} dxdt. \end{aligned}$$

Using again the fact that ξ_x is supported in $[-\beta, -\alpha] \cup [1 + \alpha, 1 + \beta]$ where $\tilde{a}'$ is bounded (recall that, using the assumption on a, $\tilde{a}$ is C^1 far away from $x_0, 0$ and 1 in the weakly degenerate case and it is $W^{1,\infty}(-1,2)$ in the strongly degenerate one), it follows

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \int_{-\beta-\delta}^{1+\beta+\delta} H^2 e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}} dxdt = \int_0^T \int_{-\beta-\delta}^{1+\beta+\delta} (\xi \tilde{h} + (\tilde{a} \xi_x W)_x + \tilde{a} \xi_x W_x)^2 e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}} dxdt \\ &\leq C \left(\int_0^T \int_{-\beta-\delta}^{1+\beta+\delta} \tilde{h}^2 e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}} dxdt + \int_0^T \left(\int_{-\beta}^{-\alpha} + \int_{1+\alpha}^{1+\beta} \right) (W^2 + \tilde{a} W_x^2) e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}} dxdt \right) \\ &\leq C \int_0^T \int_{-1}^{2} (\tilde{h}^2 + \tilde{a} W_x^2 + W^2) e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}} dxdt. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using the definitions of $\tilde{\varphi}$, $\tilde{a}$, $\tilde{h}$ and W, it results

$$\int_0^T\int_0^1\left(s\Theta a(v_x)^2+s^3\Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}v^2\right)e^{2s\varphi}dxdt\leq C\int_0^T\int_{-1}^2(\tilde{h}^2+\tilde{a}W_x^2+W^2)e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}}dxdt$$
$$\leq C\int_0^T\int_0^1(h^2+a\Theta v_x^2+v^2)e^{2s\varphi}dxdt \tag{4.11}$$

for all $s\geq s_0$. Hence, we can choose s_0 so large that, for all $s\geq s_0$ and for a positive constant C:

$$\int_0^T\int_0^1\left(s\Theta a(v_x)^2+s^3\Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}v^2\right)e^{2s\varphi}dxdt\leq C\int_0^T\int_0^1(h^2+v^2)e^{2s\varphi}dxdt.$$

The last part of the theorem follows by (4.4). Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T\int_0^1\left(s\Theta a(v_x)^2+s^3\Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}v^2\right)e^{2s\varphi}dxdt\leq C\int_0^T\int_0^1(h^2+v^2)e^{2s\varphi}dxdt\\&=C\left(\int_0^T\int_0^1h^2dxdt+\int_0^T\int_{(0,1)\setminus\omega}v^2e^{2s\varphi}dxdt+\int_0^T\int_\omega v^2e^{2s\varphi}dxdt\right)\\&\leq C\left(\int_0^T\int_0^1h^2dxdt+\int_0^T\int_{(0,1)\setminus\omega}\Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}v^2e^{2s\varphi}dxdt+\int_0^T\int_\omega v^2e^{2s\varphi}dxdt\right)\\&\leq C\left(\int_0^T\int_0^1h^2dxdt+\int_0^T\int_0^1\Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}v^2e^{2s\varphi}dxdt+\int_0^T\int_\omega v^2e^{2s\varphi}dxdt\right).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can choose s_0 so large that, for all $s\geq s_0$ and for a positive constant C:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T\int_0^1\left(s\Theta a(v_x)^2+s^3\Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}v^2\right)e^{2s\varphi}dxdt\\&\leq C\left(\int_0^T\int_0^1h^2dxdt+\int_0^T\int_\omega v^2e^{2s\varphi}dxdt\right).\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

We underline that, in the weakly degenerate case, the assumption $a\in C^1[0,1]\setminus\{x_0\}$ is crucial in the previous proof. Indeed, thanks to it, we are able to estimate the integral $\int_0^T\int_{-\beta-\delta}^{1+\beta+\delta}[(\tilde{a}\xi_xW)_x]^2e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}}dxdt$.

5 Carleman estimate for degenerate parabolic problems: the non divergence case

In this section we prove the analogue of the Carleman estimate given in Theorem 4.1 for the adjoint problem of (1.2) in the non divergence case, when the degeneracy is weak or strong:

$$\begin{cases}v_t+av_{xx}=h, & (t,x)\in Q_T,\\ v_x(t,0)=v_x(t,1)=0, & t\in(0,T).\end{cases}\tag{5.1}$$

Here $h\in L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(Q_T)$, while on a we make the following assumptions:

Hypothesis 5.1. The function a is such that

1. the operator A_2 is weakly or strongly degenerate;
2. the function $\dfrac{(x-x_0)a'(x)}{a(x)} \in W^{1,\infty}(0,1)$;
3. if $K \geq \dfrac{1}{2}$ (4.2) holds.

Remark 3. We underline the fact that in the non divergence case the assumptions on a are weaker than in the divergence case. Indeed the integrals that appear in the proof of the Carleman estimate do not contain the derivative of a, thus we don't required any bound on it (see, in particular, (5.7)). Moreover, the additional condition when $K > 3/2$ is not necessary, since all integrals and integrations by parts are justified by the definition of $D(A_2)$.

Moreover, Hypothesis 4.1.3 is substituted by Hypothesis 5.1.3, which is essential to prove [19, Theorem 4.2] (see [19, Lemma 4.3] and [8, Lemma 3.10] or [9, Lemma 5] for the case when the degeneracy occurs at the boundary of the domain).

To prove an estimate of Carleman type, we proceed as before. To this aim, as in [19, Chapter 4], let us introduce the function $\gamma(t,x) := \Theta(t)\mu(x)$, where Θ is as in (4.3) and

$$\mu(x) := d_1 \left(\int_{x_0}^{x} \frac{y-x_0}{a(y)} e^{R(y-x_0)^2} dy - d_2 \right). \tag{5.2}$$

Here $d_2 > \max \left\{ \dfrac{(1-x_0)^2 e^{R(1-x_0)^2}}{(2-K)a(1)}, \dfrac{x_0^2 e^{Rx_0^2}}{(2-K)a(0)} \right\}$, R and d_1 are strictly positive constants. The main result of this section is the following:

Theorem 5.1. *Assume Hypothesis* 5.1. *Then, there exist two positive constants* C *and* s_0, *such that every solution* v *of* (5.1) *in* $\mathcal{S} := H^1\big(0,T; H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)\big) \cap L^2\big(0,T; H^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)\big)$ *satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \int_0^1 \left(s\Theta (v_x)^2 + s^3 \Theta^3 \left(\frac{x-x_0}{a} \right)^2 v^2 \right) e^{2s\gamma} dxdt \\ &\leq C \left(\int_0^T \int_0^1 h^2 \frac{e^{2s\gamma}}{a} dxdt + \int_0^T \int_0^1 v^2 e^{2s\gamma} dxdt \right) \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

for all $s \geq s_0$.

In particular, if ω *is a strict subset of* $(0,1)$ *such that* $x_0 \in \omega$, *then* (5.3) *becomes*

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \int_0^1 \left(s\Theta (v_x)^2 + s^3 \Theta^3 \left(\frac{x-x_0}{a} \right)^2 v^2 \right) e^{2s\gamma} dxdt \\ &\leq C \left(\int_0^T \int_0^1 h^2 \frac{e^{2s\gamma}}{a} dxdt + \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 e^{2s\gamma} dxdt \right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

Concerning the previous theorem we can make the same considerations of Remark 2. Moreover, using the fact that $L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) \subset L^2(0,1)$, from (5.3) we can obtain

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 \left(s\Theta (v_x)^2 + s^3 \Theta^3 \left(\frac{x-x_0}{a} \right)^2 v^2 \right) e^{2s\gamma} dxdt \leq C \int_0^T \int_0^1 (h^2 + v^2) \frac{e^{2s\gamma}}{a} dxdt.$$

However, in Section 6, we will use the previous version (see (6.22)).

To prove Theorem 5.1, we will use the Carleman estimate given in [19, Theorem 4.2] for the analogous problem of (5.1) with Dirichlet boundary conditions:

Theorem 5.2. *Assume Hypothesis* 5.1. *Then, there exist two positive constants C and s_0 such that every solution $v \in H^1\big(0,T;\mathcal{H}^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)\big) \cap L^2\big(0,T;\mathcal{H}^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)\big)$ of*

$$\begin{cases} v_t + av_{xx} = h & (t,x) \in Q_T, \\ v(t,0) = v(t,1) = 0 & t \in (0,T), \end{cases}$$

satisfies, for all $s \geq s_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{Q_T} \left(s\Theta (v_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \left(\frac{x-x_0}{a}\right)^2 v^2 \right) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\ &\leq C \left(\int_{Q_T} h^2 \frac{e^{2s\varphi}}{a} dxdt + sd_1 \int_0^T \left[\Theta e^{2s\varphi}(x-x_0)(v_x)^2 dt\right]_{x=0}^{x=1} \right), \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

where d_1 is the constant introduced in (5.2). *Here*

$$\mathcal{H}^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) := L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) \cap H^1_0(0,1),$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) := \Big\{ u \in \mathcal{H}^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1) \,\big|\, u' \in H^1(0,1) \Big\}.$$

Proof of Theorem 5.1. The proof is similar to the one of Theorem 4.1. So we sketch it. To this aim consider α, β, δ, ξ, W and Z as before. Obviously, W and Z satisfy, respectively, the following problems

$$\begin{cases} W_t + \tilde a W_{xx} = \tilde h, & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (-1,2), \\ W_x(t,-1) = W_x(t,2) = 0, & t \in (0,T) \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} Z_t + \tilde a Z_{xx} = H, & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (-\beta-\delta, 1+\beta+\delta), \\ Z(t,-\beta-\delta) = Z(t,1+\beta+\delta) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \end{cases}$$

being $\tilde a$ and $\tilde h$ defined as before and $H := \xi \tilde h + \tilde a(\xi_{xx} W + 2\xi_x W_x)$. Observe that $Z_x(t,-\beta-\delta) = Z_x(t,1+\beta+\delta) = 0$ and, by the assumption on a, $H \in L^2((0,T); L^2_{\frac{1}{\tilde a}}(-\beta-\delta, 1+\beta+\delta))$. Now, define $\tilde\gamma(t,x) := \Theta(t)\tilde\mu(x)$, where

$$\tilde\mu(x) := \begin{cases} \mu(2-x) = d_1 \left[\displaystyle\int_{2-x_0}^x \frac{t-2+x_0}{\tilde a(t)} e^{R(2-t-x_0)} dt - d_2 \right], & x \in [1,2], \\ \mu(x), & x \in [0,1], \\ \mu(-x) = d_1 \left[\displaystyle\int_{-x_0}^x \frac{t+x_0}{\tilde a(t)} e^{R(-t-x_0)} dt - d_2 \right], & x \in [-1,0]. \end{cases} \tag{5.6}$$

Thus, we can apply the analogue of Theorem 5.2 on $(-\beta-\delta, 1+\beta+\delta)$ in place of $(0,1)$ and with weight $\tilde\gamma$, obtaining that there exist two positive constants C and s_0 (s_0 sufficiently large), such that, for all $s \geq s_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \int_{-\beta-\delta}^{1+\beta+\delta} \left(s\Theta (Z_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \left(\frac{x-x_0}{\tilde a}\right)^2 Z^2 \right) e^{2s\tilde\gamma} dxdt \\ &\leq C \left(\int_0^T \int_{-\beta-\delta}^{1+\beta+\delta} H^2 \frac{e^{2s\tilde\gamma}}{\tilde a} dxdt + sd_1 \int_0^T \left[\tilde\Theta e^{2s\tilde\gamma}(x-x_0)(Z_x)^2 dt\right]_{x=-\beta-\delta}^{x=1+\beta+\delta} \right) \\ &= C \int_0^T \int_{-\beta-\delta}^{1+\beta+\delta} H^2 \frac{e^{2s\tilde\gamma}}{\tilde a} dxdt. \end{aligned}$$

By definition of ξ, W and Z, proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\int_0^1\left(s\Theta(v_x)^2+s^3\Theta^3\left(\frac{x-x_0}{a}\right)^2v^2\right)e^{2s\gamma}dxdt\le C\int_0^T\int_{-\beta-\delta}^{1+\beta+\delta}H^2\frac{e^{2s\tilde\gamma}}{\tilde a}dxdt\\
&=\int_0^T\int_{-\beta-\delta}^{1+\beta+\delta}(\xi\tilde h+\tilde a(\xi_{xx}W+2\xi_xW_x))^2\frac{e^{2s\tilde\gamma}}{\tilde a}dxdt\\
&\le C\left(\int_0^T\int_{-\beta}^{1+\beta}\tilde h^2\frac{e^{2s\tilde\gamma}}{\tilde a}dxdt+\int_0^T\left(\int_{-\beta}^{-\alpha}+\int_{1+\alpha}^{1+\beta}\right)(W^2+W_x^2)e^{2s\tilde\gamma}dxdt\right)\\
&\le C\int_0^T\int_{-1}^2\left(\frac{\tilde h^2}{\tilde a}+W^2+W_x^2\right)e^{2s\tilde\gamma}dxdt.
\end{aligned}\tag{5.7}$$

As before, using the definitions of $\tilde\gamma$, $\tilde a$, $\tilde h$ and W, it results

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\int_0^1\left(s\Theta(v_x)^2+s^3\Theta^3\left(\frac{x-x_0}{a}\right)^2v^2\right)e^{2s\gamma}dxdt\le C\int_0^T\int_{-1}^2\left(\frac{\tilde h^2}{\tilde a}+W^2+W_x^2\right)e^{2s\tilde\gamma}dxdt\\
&\le C\int_0^T\int_0^1\left(\frac{h^2}{a}+v^2+\Theta v_x^2\right)e^{2s\gamma}dxdt,
\end{aligned}$$

for a positive constant C. Hence, we can choose s_0 so large that, for all $s\ge s_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\int_0^1\left(s\Theta(v_x)^2+s^3\Theta^3\left(\frac{x-x_0}{a}\right)^2v^2\right)e^{2s\gamma}dxdt\\
&\le C\left(\int_0^T\int_0^1h^2\frac{e^{2s\gamma}}{a}dxdt+\int_0^T\int_0^1v^2e^{2s\gamma}dxdt\right),
\end{aligned}$$

for a positive constant C. The last part of the Theorem follows as in the proof of Theorem 4.1. □

6 Observability inequalities as applications of Carleman estimates

In this section we consider problem (1.4) and we make the following assumptions which are the same as in [19] (see Hypotheses 5.2 and 5.3):

Hypothesis 6.1. Assume Hypotheses 4.1. Moreover if the operator A_1 is weakly degenerate then there exist two functions $\mathfrak{g}\in L^\infty_{\text{loc}}([0,1]\setminus\{x_0\})$, $\mathfrak{h}\in W^{1,\infty}_{\text{loc}}([0,1]\setminus\{x_0\};L^\infty(0,1))$ and two strictly positive constants $\mathfrak{g}_0$, $\mathfrak{h}_0$ such that $\mathfrak{g}(x)\ge\mathfrak{g}_0$ for a.e. x in $[0,1]$ and

$$-\frac{a'(x)}{2\sqrt{a(x)}}\left(\int_x^B\mathfrak{g}(t)dt+\mathfrak{h}_0\right)+\sqrt{a(x)}\mathfrak{g}(x)=\mathfrak{h}(x,B)\quad\text{for a.e. }x,B\in[0,1]\tag{6.1}$$

with $x<B<x_0$ or $x_0<x<B$.

Hypothesis 6.2. Assume Hypotheses 5.1. Moreover if the operator A_2 is weakly degenerate then there exist two functions $\mathfrak{g}\in L^\infty_{\text{loc}}([0,1]\setminus\{x_0\})$, $\mathfrak{h}\in W^{1,\infty}_{\text{loc}}([0,1]\setminus\{x_0\};L^\infty(0,1))$ and two strictly positive constants $\mathfrak{g}_0$, $\mathfrak{h}_0$ such that $\mathfrak{g}(x)\ge\mathfrak{g}_0$ for a.e. x in $[0,1]$ and

$$\frac{a'(x)}{2\sqrt{a(x)}}\left(\int_x^B\mathfrak{g}(t)dt+\mathfrak{h}_0\right)+\sqrt{a(x)}\mathfrak{g}(x)=\mathfrak{h}(x,B)\quad\text{for a.e. }x,B\in[0,1]\tag{6.2}$$

with $x<B<x_0$ or $x_0<x<B$.

Obviously, with $W^{1,\infty}_{\text{loc}}([0,1]\setminus\{x_0\}; L^\infty(0,1))$ we denote the space of functions belonging to $W^{1,\infty}([0,1]; L^\infty(0,1))$ far away from $\{x_0\}$.

Remark 4. Since we require identities (6.1) and (6.2) far from x_0, once a is given, it is easy to find $\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{g}_0$ and $\mathfrak{h}_0$ with the desired properties. For example, if $a(x) := |x - x_0|^\alpha, \alpha \in (0,1)$, in (6.1) we can take $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{h}_0 = 1 = \mathfrak{g}(x)$, for all $x \in [0,1]$, and $\mathfrak{h}(x,B) = |x-x_0|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-1}\left[-\dfrac{\alpha}{2}\text{sign}(x-x_0)(B+1-x) + |x-x_0|\right]$, for all x and $B \in [0,1]$, with $x < B < x_0$ or $x_0 < x < B$. On the other hand, in (6.2) we can take $\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{h}_0$, $\mathfrak{g}$ as before and $\mathfrak{h}(x,B) = |x-x_0|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-1}\left[\dfrac{\alpha}{2}\text{sign}(x-x_0)(B+1-x) + |x-x_0|\right]$, for all x and $B \in [0,1]$, with $x < B < x_0$ or $x_0 < x < B$. Clearly, in both cases, $\mathfrak{g} \in L^\infty_{\text{loc}}([0,1]\setminus\{x_0\})$ and $\mathfrak{h} \in W^{1,\infty}_{\text{loc}}([0,1]\setminus\{x_0\}; L^\infty(0,1))$.

In addition we assume that the control set ω is an interval which contains the degeneracy point or an interval lying on one side of the degeneracy point.

Now, we associate to (1.4) the homogeneous adjoint problem

$$\begin{cases} v_t + Av = 0, & (t,x) \in Q_T, \\ v_x(t,0) = v_x(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ v(T,x) = v_T(x) \in X, \end{cases} \tag{6.3}$$

where $T > 0$ is given and, we recall, X denotes the Hilbert space $L^2(0,1)$ or $L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)$ in the divergence or in the non divergence case, respectively. By the Carleman estimates given in Theorems 4.1 and 5.1, we will deduce the following observability inequalities for both the weakly and the strongly degenerate cases:

Proposition 6.1. *Assume Hypotheses* 6.1. *Then there exists a positive constant* C_T *such that every solution* $v \in C([0,T]; L^2(0,1)) \cap L^2(0,T; H^1_a(0,1))$ *of* (6.3) *satisfies*

$$\int_0^1 v^2(0,x)dx \le C_T \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2(t,x)dxdt. \tag{6.4}$$

Proposition 6.2. *Assume Hypotheses* 6.2. *Then there exists a positive constant* C_T *such that every solution* $v \in C([0,T]; L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)) \cap L^2(0,T; H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1))$ *of* (6.3) *satisfies*

$$\int_0^1 v^2(0,x)\frac{1}{a}dx \le C_T \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2(t,x)\frac{1}{a}dxdt. \tag{6.5}$$

6.1 Proof of Proposition 6.1

In this subsection we will prove, as a consequence of the Carleman estimate given in Section 4, the observability inequality (6.4). The proof is similar to the one given in [18] or in [19, Proposition 5.1], so we sketch it. Thus, we consider the adjoint problem with more regular final–time datum

$$\begin{cases} v_t + A_1 v = 0, & (t,x) \in Q_T, \\ v_x(t,0) = v_x(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ v(T,x) = v_T(x) \in D(A_1^2), \end{cases} \tag{6.6}$$

where $D(A_1^2) = \Big\{ u \in D(A_1) \;\Big|\; A_1 u \in D(A_1) \Big\}$. Observe that $D(A_1^2)$ is densely defined in $D(A_1)$ (see, for example, [6, Lemma 7.2]) and hence in $L^2(0,1)$. As in [8], [9], [17], [18] or [19], letting v_T vary in $D(A_1^2)$, we define the following class of functions:

$$\mathcal{W}_1 := \Big\{ v \text{ is a solution of (6.6)} \Big\}.$$

Obviously (see, for example, [6, Theorem 7.5]) $\mathcal{W}_1 \subset C^1\big([0,T]\,;\, H^2_a(0,1)\big) \subset \mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{U}_1$, where $\mathcal{U}_1 := C([0,T]; L^2(0,1)) \cap L^2(0,T; H^1_a(0,1))$. We shall also need the following lemma, that deals with the different situations in which x_0 is inside or outside the control region ω. The statements of the conclusions are the same, however, the proofs, though inspired by the same ideas, are different. For this reason we divide the proof into two parts.

Lemma 6.1. *Assume Hypotheses* 6.1. *Then there exist two positive constants C and s_0 such that every solution $v \in \mathcal{W}_1$ of* (6.6) *satisfies, for all $s \ge s_0$,*

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 \left(s\Theta a (v_x)^2 + s^3 \Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2 \right) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \le C \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 dxdt.$$

Here Θ and φ are as in Section 4, with c_1 sufficiently large.

Proof. The proof of Lemma 6.1 is divided into two parts to distinguish the cases when ω is an interval which contains the degeneracy point or it is an interval lying on one side of the degeneracy point.

First case: $\omega = (\alpha, \beta) \subset (0,1)$ is such that $x_0 \in \omega$.

By assumption, we can find two subintervals $\omega_1 \subset (0, x_0)$ and $\omega_2 \subset (x_0, 1)$ such that $(\omega_1 \cup \omega_2) \subset\subset \omega \setminus \{x_0\}$. Now, set $\lambda_i := \inf \omega_i$ and $\beta_i := \sup \omega_i$, $i = 1, 2$ and consider a smooth function $\xi : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\xi \equiv 1$ in $[\lambda_1, \beta_2]$ and $\xi \equiv 0$ in $[0,1] \setminus \omega$. Define $w := \xi v$, where v solves (6.6). Hence, w satisfies

$$\begin{cases} w_t + (a w_x)_x = (a \xi_x v)_x + \xi_x a v_x =: f, & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (0,1), \\ w_x(t,0) = w_x(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T). \end{cases} \tag{6.7}$$

Applying Theorem 4.1, we have that there exist two positive constants C and s_0 such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \int_0^1 \Big(s\Theta a (w_x)^2 + s^3 \Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} w^2 \Big) e^{2s\varphi}\, dxdt \\ &\le C \left(\int_0^T \int_0^1 f^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + \int_0^T \int_\omega e^{2s\varphi} w^2 dxdt \right), \end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

for all $s \ge s_0$. Then, using the definition of ξ and in particular the fact that ξ_x and ξ_{xx} are supported in $\tilde\omega$, where $\tilde\omega := [\inf\omega, \lambda_1] \cup [\beta_2, \sup\omega]$, we can write $w^2 + f^2 = (\xi v)^2 + ((a\xi_x v)_x + \xi_x a v_x)^2 \le v^2 \chi_\omega + C(v^2 + (v_x)^2)\chi_{\tilde\omega}$, since the function a' is bounded on $\tilde\omega$. Hence, applying the Caccioppoli inequality [18, Proposition 4.2] and (6.8), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \int_{\lambda_1}^{\beta_2} \left(s\Theta a (v_x)^2 + s^3 \Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2 \right) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\ &\le \int_0^T \int_0^1 \Big(s\Theta a (w_x)^2 + s^3 \Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} w^2 \Big) e^{2s\varphi}\, dxdt \\ &\le C \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + C \int_0^T \int_{\tilde\omega} e^{2s\varphi} (v^2 + (v_x)^2) dxdt \le C \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 dxdt, \end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

for a positive constant C. Now, consider a smooth function $\eta : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\eta \equiv 1$ in $[\beta_2, 1]$ and $\eta \equiv 0$ in $\left[0, \dfrac{\lambda_2 + 2\beta_2}{3}\right]$. Define $z := \eta v$, where v is the solution of (6.6). Proceeding as in [19, Lemma 5.1], we get

$$\int_0^T \int_{\lambda_2}^1 \Big(s\Theta a(z_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} z^2 \Big) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \le C \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 dxdt,$$

for a positive constant C. Indeed z satisfies (4.1) in $(\lambda_2, 1)$, with $h := (a\eta_x v)_x + a\eta_x v_x$. Now, define $\Phi(t,x) := \Theta(t)\rho_{\lambda_2,1}(x)$, where Θ is as in (4.3),

$$\rho_{\lambda_2,1}(x) := \begin{cases} -r\left[\displaystyle\int_{\lambda_2}^x \frac{1}{\sqrt{a(t)}} \int_t^1 \mathfrak{g}(s) ds dt + \int_{\lambda_2}^x \frac{\mathfrak{h}_0}{\sqrt{a(t)}} dt \right] - \mathfrak{c}, & \text{in the weakly degenerate case,} \\ e^{r\zeta(x)} - \mathfrak{c}, & \text{in the strongly degenerate case,} \end{cases} \tag{6.10}$$

$$\zeta(x) = \mathfrak{d} \int_x^1 \frac{1}{a(t)} dt,$$

where $\mathfrak{d} = \|a'\|_{L^\infty(\lambda_2,1)}$, $r > 0$ and $\mathfrak{c} > 0$ is chosen in the second case in such a way that $\max\limits_{[\lambda_2,1]} \rho_{\lambda_2,1} < 0$.

Thanks to Hypothesis 6.1, we can apply the Carleman estimates stated in [19, Theorem 3.1] for non degenerate parabolic problems with *non smooth coefficient* in $(\lambda_2, 1)$. Moreover, since h is supported in $\left[\dfrac{\lambda_2 + 2\beta_2}{2}, \beta_2\right]$ and using the Caccioppoli inequality [18, Proposition 4.2], we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \int_{\lambda_2}^1 s\Theta(z_x)^2 e^{2s\Phi} dxdt + \int_0^T \int_{\lambda_2}^1 s^3\Theta^3 z^2 e^{2s\Phi} dxdt \\ &\le c \int_0^T \int_{\lambda_2}^1 e^{2s\Phi} h^2 dxdt \le C \int_0^T \int_{\tilde\omega_1} v^2 dxdt + C \int_0^T \int_{\tilde\omega_1} e^{2s\Phi}(v_x)^2 dxdt \\ &\le C \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 dxdt, \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

where $\tilde\omega_1 = (\lambda_2, \beta_2)$.

Now, choose the constant c_1 in (4.3) so that

$$c_1 \ge \begin{cases} \dfrac{r\left[\displaystyle\int_{\lambda_2}^1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{a(t)}} \int_t^1 \mathfrak{g}(s) ds dt + \int_{\lambda_2}^1 \frac{\mathfrak{h}_0}{\sqrt{a(t)}} dt \right] + \mathfrak{c}}{c_2 - \dfrac{(1-x_0)^2}{a(1)(2-K)}} =: \Pi & \text{in the weakly degenerate case,} \\ \dfrac{\mathfrak{c} - 1}{c_2 - \dfrac{(1-x_0)^2}{a(1)(2-K)}} & \text{in the strongly degenerate case,} \end{cases} \tag{6.12}$$

where $\mathfrak{c}$ is the constant appearing in (6.10). Then, by definition of φ, the choice of c_1 and [18, Lemma 2.1], one can prove that there exists a positive constant k, for example

$$k = \max\left\{ \max_{[\lambda_2,1]} a, \frac{(1-x_0)^2}{a(1)} \right\},$$

such that

$$a(x)e^{2s\varphi(t,x)} \le k e^{2s\Phi(t,x)} \tag{6.13}$$

and

$$\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a(x)}e^{2s\varphi(t,x)} \le ke^{2s\Phi(t,x)} \tag{6.14}$$

for every $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times [\lambda_2, 1]$. Note that the value of k can be immediately found by estimating the coefficients of $e^{2s\varphi(t,x)}$ in (6.13) and (6.14), once known that $e^{2s\varphi(t,x)} \le e^{2s\Phi(t,x)}$, using [18, Lemma 2.1]. Finally, condition (6.12) is a sufficient one to get $e^{2s\varphi(t,x)} \le e^{2s\Phi(t,x)}$, and it can be found by using [18, Lemma 2.1] and rough estimates.
Thus, by (6.11), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\int_{\lambda_2}^1 \Big(s\Theta a(z_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}z^2\Big)e^{2s\varphi}dxdt\\
&\le k\int_0^T\int_{\lambda_2}^1 s\Theta(z_x)^2e^{2s\Phi}dxdt + k\int_0^T\int_{\lambda_2}^1 s^3\Theta^3z^2e^{2s\Phi}dxdt\\
&\le kC\int_0^T\int_\omega v^2dxdt,
\end{aligned}$$

for a positive constant C. As a trivial consequence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\int_{\beta_2}^1 \Big(s\Theta a(v_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}v^2\Big)e^{2s\varphi}dxdt\\
&\le \int_0^T\int_{\lambda_2}^1 \Big(s\Theta a(z_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}z^2\Big)e^{2s\varphi}dxdt \le C\int_0^T\int_\omega v^2dxdt,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

for a positive constant C. Thus (6.9) and (6.15) imply

$$\int_0^T\int_{\lambda_1}^1 \Big(s\Theta a(v_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}v^2\Big)e^{2s\varphi}\,dxdt \le C\int_0^T\int_\omega v^2dxdt, \tag{6.16}$$

for some positive constant C. To complete the proof it is sufficient to prove a similar inequality on the interval $[0,\lambda_1]$. To this aim, we follow a reflection procedure considering in $[-1,1]$ the function W defined in (4.7) (in this case v solves (6.6)). Then W satisfies the equation of (4.8) in $(0,T)\times(-1,1)$ and $W_x(t,-1) = W_x(t,1) = 0$. Now, consider a cut off function $\rho : [-1,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\rho \equiv 1$ in $(-\lambda_1, \lambda_1)$ and $\rho \equiv 0$ in $\left[-1, -\frac{\lambda_1+2\beta_1}{3}\right] \cup \left[\frac{\lambda_1+2\beta_1}{3}, 1\right]$. Define $Z := \rho W$, $\tilde\varphi(t,x) := \Theta(t)\tilde\psi(x)$, where $\tilde\psi$ is the function defined in (4.10) but restricted to $[-1,1]$ and

$$c_1 \ge \max\left\{\Pi, \frac{r\left[\displaystyle\int_{-\beta_1}^{\beta_1}\frac{1}{\sqrt{a(t)}}\int_t^1\mathfrak{g}(s)dsdt + \int_{-\beta_1}^{\beta_1}\frac{\mathfrak{h}_0}{\sqrt{a(t)}}dt\right] + \mathfrak{c}}{c_2 - \dfrac{x_0^2}{a(0)(2-K)}}\right\},$$

in the weakly degenerate case, and

$$c_1 \ge \max\left\{\frac{\mathfrak{c}-1}{c_2 - \dfrac{(1-x_0)^2}{a(1)(2-K)}}, \frac{\mathfrak{c}-1}{c_2 - \dfrac{x_0^2}{a(0)(2-K)}}\right\},$$

in the strong one. Thus, by definition of $\tilde{\varphi}$, one can prove as before that there exists a positive constant k, for example

$$k = \max\left\{ \max_{[-\beta_1,\beta_1]} \tilde{a}, \frac{x_0^2}{a(0)} \right\},$$

such that

$$\tilde{a}(x)e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}(t,x)} \le k e^{2s\Phi(t,x)}$$

and

$$\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{\tilde{a}(x)} e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}(t,x)} \le k e^{2s\Phi(t,x)}$$

for every $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times[-\beta_1,\beta_1]$. Here $\tilde{a}$ is the function introduced in (4.9) restricted to $[-\beta_1,\beta_1]$. Applying again the Carleman estimates for a non degenerate problem with *non smooth coefficient* proved in [19, Theorem 3.1], there exist two positive constants, that we call again C and s_0, such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \int_{-\beta_1}^{\beta_1} \Big(s\Theta\tilde{a}(Z_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{\tilde{a}} Z^2\Big) e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}} dxdt \\
&\le k\int_0^T \int_{-\beta_1}^{\beta_1} s\Theta (Z_x)^2 e^{2s\Phi} dxdt + k\int_0^T \int_{-\beta_1}^{\beta_1} s^3\Theta^3 Z^2 e^{2s\Phi} dxdt \\
&\le C\int_0^T \int_{-\beta_1}^{\beta_1} e^{2s\Phi} h^2 dxdt \\
&\le C\int_0^T \int_{-\frac{\lambda_1+2\beta_1}{2}}^{-\lambda_1} e^{2s\Phi}(W^2+(W_x)^2) dxdt + C\int_0^T \int_{\lambda_1}^{\frac{\lambda_1+2\beta_1}{2}} e^{2s\Phi}(W^2+(W_x)^2) dxdt \\
&\le C\int_0^T \int_{\lambda_1}^{\frac{\lambda_1+2\beta_1}{2}} e^{2s\Phi}(W^2+(W_x)^2) dxdt \\
&\le C\int_0^T \int_{\lambda_1}^{\frac{\lambda_1+2\beta_1}{2}} v^2 dxdt + C\int_0^T \int_{\lambda_1}^{\frac{\lambda_1+2\beta_1}{2}} e^{2s\Phi}(v_x)^2 dxdt \le C\int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 dxdt,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.17}$$

for all $s \ge s_0$. Hence, by (6.17) and the definition of W and Z, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \int_0^{\lambda_1} \Big(s^3\Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2 + s\Theta a(v_x)^2\Big) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\
&\le \int_0^T \int_{-\lambda_1}^{\lambda_1} \Big(s^3\Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{\tilde{a}} W^2 + s\Theta\tilde{a}(W_x)^2\Big) e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}} dxdt \\
&\le \int_0^T \int_{-\beta_1}^{\beta_1} \Big(s^3\Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{\tilde{a}} Z^2 + s\Theta\tilde{a}(Z_x)^2\Big) e^{2s\tilde{\varphi}} dxdt \le C\int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 dxdt,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.18}$$

for a positive constant C. Therefore, by (6.16) and (6.18), Lemma 6.1 follows.

Second case: $\omega = (\alpha,\beta) \subset (0,1)$ *is such that* $x_0 \notin \bar{\omega}$.

The idea is quite similar to the first part of the proof, so we will go faster in the calculations. Suppose that $x_0 < \alpha$ (the proof is analogous if we assume that $\beta < x_0$ with obvious adaptations); moreover, set $\lambda := \dfrac{2\alpha+\beta}{3}$ and $\zeta := \dfrac{\alpha+2\beta}{3}$, so that $\alpha < \lambda < \zeta < \beta$. Then define $w := \xi v$, where v is any fixed solution of (6.6) and ξ is a cut off function such that $\xi \equiv 0$ in $[0,\alpha]\cup[\beta,1]$ and $\xi \equiv 1$ in $[\lambda,\zeta]$. Hence w satisfies (6.7) and $f^2 \le C(v^2+(v_x)^2)\chi_{\hat{\omega}}$, where $\hat{\omega} = (\alpha,\lambda)\cup(\zeta,\beta)$. Applying Theorem 4.1 to w, we have that there exist two positive constants C and s_0 such that

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 \Big(s\Theta a(w_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}\ w^2\Big) e^{2s\varphi}\, dxdt \le C \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi}(w^2+f^2)dxdt, \tag{6.19}$$

for all $s \ge s_0$. Hence, using [18, Proposition 4.2], we find

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \int_\lambda^\zeta \left(s\Theta a(v_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2\right) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\
&\le \int_0^T \int_0^1 \Big(s\Theta a(w_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} w^2\Big) e^{2s\varphi}\, dxdt \\
&\le C \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + C \int_0^T \int_{\hat\omega} e^{2s\varphi}(v^2+(v_x)^2)dxdt \le C \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 xdt.
\end{aligned}$$

As in the first case of the proof, consider a smooth function η such that $\eta \equiv 0$ in $[0,\lambda]$ and $\eta \equiv 1$ in $[\zeta, 1]$. Defining $z := \eta v$, one can prove again

$$\int_0^T \int_\alpha^1 \Big(s\Theta a(z_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} z^2\Big) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \le C \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 dxdt,$$

for a positive constant C and s large enough. Hence,

$$\int_0^T \int_\lambda^1 \Big(s\Theta a(v_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2\Big) e^{2s\varphi}\, dxdt \le C \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 dxdt, \tag{6.20}$$

for some positive constant C and $s \ge s_0$. To complete the proof it is sufficient to prove a similar inequality for $x \in [0, \lambda]$. Using a reflection procedure as in the first part of the proof, where this time ρ is a smooth function such that $\rho : [-1,1] \to \mathbb{R}$, $\rho \equiv 0$ in $[-1, -\zeta] \cup [\zeta, 1]$ and $\rho \equiv 1$ in $[-\lambda, \lambda]$ and applying Theorem 4.2, one has

$$\int_0^T \int_0^\lambda \left(s\Theta a(v_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2\right) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \le C \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 dxdt, \tag{6.21}$$

for a positive constant C and s large enough. Therefore, by (6.20) and (6.21), the conclusion follows. $\square$

We underline that to prove Lemma 6.1 a crucial role is played by the Carleman estimates stated in [19, Theorem 3.1] for non degenerate parabolic problems with *non smooth coefficient*. Moreover, in order to apply such a result equation (6.1) is essential.

Using Lemma 6.1, we obtain the following result which is crucial to prove Proposition 6.1:

Lemma 6.2. *Assume Hypotheses* 6.1. *Then there exists a positive constant C_T such that every solution $v \in \mathcal{W}_1$ of* (6.6) *satisfies* (6.4).

Proof. The proof is similar to the one of [19, Lemma 5.3], but we quickly repeat it for the reader's convenience.
Multiplying the equation of (6.6) by v_t and integrating by parts over $(0,1)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \int_0^1 (v_t + (av_x)_x) v_t dx = \int_0^1 (v_t^2 + (av_x)_x v_t) dx = \int_0^1 v_t^2 dx + [av_x v_t]_{x=0}^{x=1} \\
&- \int_0^1 a v_x v_{tx} dx = \int_0^1 v_t^2 dx - \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 a(v_x)^2 \ge -\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 a(v_x)^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the function $t \mapsto \int_0^1 a(v_x)^2 dx$ is increasing for all $t \in [0,T]$. In particular,

$$\int_0^1 av_x(0,x)^2 dx \le \int_0^1 av_x(t,x)^2 dx \text{ for every } t \in [0,T].$$

Integrating the last inequality over $\left[\frac{T}{4}, \frac{3T}{4}\right]$ and using Lemma 6.1 we have that there exists a positive constant C such that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^1 a(v_x)^2(0,x)dx &\le \frac{2}{T}\int_{\frac{T}{4}}^{\frac{3T}{4}}\int_0^1 a(v_x)^2(t,x)dxdt \\ &\le C_T \int_{\frac{T}{4}}^{\frac{3T}{4}}\int_0^1 s\Theta a(v_x)^2(t,x)e^{2s\varphi}dxdt \le C\int_0^T\int_\omega v^2 dxdt.\end{aligned}$$

Applying the Hardy- Poincaré inequality given in [18, Proposition 2.3] and the previous inequality, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^1 \left(\frac{a}{(x-x_0)^2}\right)^{1/3} v^2(0,x)dx &\le \int_0^1 \frac{p}{(x-x_0)^2} v^2(0,x)dx \\ &\le C_{HP}\int_0^1 p(v_x)^2(0,x)dx \\ &\le \max\{C_1, C_2\} C_{HP}\int_0^1 a(v_x)^2(0,x)dx \\ &\le C\int_0^T\int_\omega v^2 dxdt,\end{aligned}$$

for a positive constant C. Here $p(x) = (a(x)|x-x_0|^4)^{1/3}$ if $K > \frac{4}{3}$ or $p(x) = \max_{[0,1]} a|x-x_0|^{4/3}$ otherwise,

$$C_1 := \max\left\{\left(\frac{x_0^2}{a(0)}\right)^{2/3}, \left(\frac{(1-x_0)^2}{a(1)}\right)^{2/3}\right\},$$

$C_2 := \max\left\{\frac{x_0^{4/3}}{a(0)}, \frac{(1-x_0)^{4/3}}{a(1)}\right\}$ and C_{HP} is the Hardy-Poincaré constant.

By [18, Lemma 2.1], the function $x \mapsto \frac{a(x)}{(x-x_0)^2}$ is nondecreasing on $[0,x_0)$ and nonincreasing on $(x_0,1]$; then

$$\left(\frac{a(x)}{(x-x_0)^2}\right)^{1/3} \ge C_3 := \min\left\{\left(\frac{a(1)}{(1-x_0)^2}\right)^{1/3}, \left(\frac{a(0)}{x_0^2}\right)^{1/3}\right\} > 0.$$

Hence

$$C_3\int_0^1 v(0,x)^2 dx \le C\int_0^T\int_\omega v^2 dxdt$$

and the thesis follows.

□

Using Lemma 6.2 and proceeding as in [19, Proposition 5.1], one can prove Proposition 6.1.

6.2 Proof of Proposition 6.2

As for the proof of Proposition 6.2, we consider again the adjoint problem (6.6) where the operator A_1 is replaced by A_2. In this case,

$$\mathcal{W}_2 := \Big\{v \text{ is a solution of (6.6), with } A_2 \text{ in place of } A_1\Big\}$$

with $\mathcal{W}_2 \subset C^1\big([0,T]; H^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)\big) \subset \mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{U}_2$, and $\mathcal{U}_2 := C([0,T]; L^2_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1)) \cap L^2(0,T; H^1_{\frac{1}{a}}(0,1))$. As in [19, Lemma 5.4], one can prove

Lemma 6.3. *Assume Hypotheses* 6.2. *Then there exist two positive constants C and s_0 such that every solution $v \in \mathcal{W}_2$ of* (6.6) *satisfies*

$$\int_0^T\int_0^1 \left(s\Theta(v_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3\left(\frac{x-x_0}{a}\right)^2 v^2\right)e^{2s\gamma}dxdt \le C\int_0^T\int_w v^2\frac{1}{a}dxdt$$

for all $s \ge s_0$. Here Θ and γ are as in Section 5, with d_1 sufficiently large.

The proof of the previous lemma is similar to the one of [19, Lemma 5.4] if ω does not contain the degenerate point. On the other hand, if ω contains x_0, one can proceed as in the first part of the proof of Lemma 6.1 with the suitable changes, but we repeat here for the reader's convenience. Also in this case, we underline that for the proof a crucial role is played by the Carleman estimates stated in [19, Theorem 3.2] for non degenerate parabolic problems with *non smooth coefficient*. Again, to apply such a result equation (6.2) is essential. Another important result to prove Lemma 6.3 is the following Caccioppoli inequality for the non divergence case:

Proposition 6.3 (Caccioppoli's inequality)**.** *Assume that either the function a is such that the associated operator A_2 is weakly degenerate and* (6.2) *holds or the function a is such that A_2 is strongly degenerate. Moreover, let I' and I two open subintervals of* $(0,1)$ *such that $I' \subset\subset I \subset (0,1)$ and $x_0 \notin \overline{I}$. Let $\varphi(t,x) = \Theta(t)\Upsilon(x)$, where Θ is defined in* (4.3) *and $\Upsilon \in C([0,1],(-\infty,0)) \cap C^1([0,1]\setminus\{x_0\},(-\infty,0))$ satisfies $|\Upsilon_x| \le \dfrac{c}{\sqrt{a}}$ in $[0,1]\setminus\{x_0\}$, for some $c > 0$. Then, there exist two positive constants C and s_0 such that every solution $v \in \mathcal{W}_2$ of the adjoint problem* (6.6) *satisfies, for all $s \ge s_0$,*

$$\int_0^T\int_{I'} (v_x)^2 e^{2s\varphi}dxdt \ \le\ C\int_0^T\int_I v^2\frac{1}{a}dxdt.$$

We omit the proof of the previous result since it is similar to the one of [19, Proposition 5.4].

Remark 5. Of course, our prototype for Υ is the function μ defined in (5.2). Indeed, if μ is as in (5.2), then, by [18, *Lemma*2.1],

$$|\mu'(x)| = d_1\frac{|x-x_0|e^{R(x-x_0)^2}}{a(x)} = d_1\sqrt{\frac{|x-x_0|^2e^{2R(x-x_0)^2}}{a(x)}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{a(x)}} \le c\frac{1}{\sqrt{a(x)}}.$$

Proof of Lemma 6.3. Assume that $\omega = (\alpha,\beta) \subset (0,1)$ and $x_0 \in \omega$. It follows that we can find two subintervals $\omega_1 = (\lambda_1,\beta_1) \subset (0,x_0)$ and $\omega_2 = (\lambda_2,\beta_2) \subset (x_0,1)$ such that $\alpha < \lambda_1 < \beta_1 < x_0$ and $x_0 < \lambda_2 < \beta_2 < \beta$. Now, consider a smooth function $\xi : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\xi \equiv 1$ in $[\lambda_1,\beta_2]$ and $\xi \equiv 0$ in $[0,1]\setminus\left(\dfrac{\alpha+2\lambda_1}{3}, \dfrac{\beta_2+2\beta}{3}\right)$. Define $w := \xi v$, where v is the solution of (6.6), where, we recall, A_1 is replaced by A_2. Hence, w satisfies

$$\begin{cases} w_t + aw_{xx} = a(\xi_{xx}v + 2\xi_x v_x) =: f, & (t,x) \in (0,T)\times(0,1),\\ w_x(t,0) = w_x(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T).\end{cases}$$

Applying Theorem 5.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Big(s\Theta(w_x)^2+s^3\Theta^3\left(\frac{x-x_0}{a}\right)^2 w^2\Big)e^{2s\gamma}\,dxdt\\
&\le C\left(\int_0^T\int_0^1 \frac{e^{2s\gamma}}{a}f^2dxdt+\int_0^T\int_\omega w^2e^{2s\gamma}dxdt\right),
\end{aligned}\tag{6.22}$$

for all $s \ge s_0$ and for a positive constant C. Then, using the definition of ξ and in particular the fact that ξ_x and ξ_{xx} are supported in $\tilde\omega$, where $\tilde\omega := \left[\frac{\alpha+2\lambda_1}{3},\lambda_1\right]\cup\left[\beta_2,\frac{\beta_2+2\beta}{3}\right]$, we can write $w^2+\frac{f^2}{a}\le v^2\chi_\omega + C(v^2+(v_x)^2)\chi_{\tilde\omega}$. Hence, applying (6.22) and Proposition 6.3 with $I'=\tilde\omega$ and $I=(\alpha,\beta_1)\cup(\lambda_2,\beta)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\int_{\lambda_1}^{\beta_2}\left(s\Theta(v_x)^2+s^3\Theta^3\left(\frac{x-x_0}{a}\right)^2 v^2\right)e^{2s\gamma}dxdt\\
&\le \int_0^T\int_0^1\left(s\Theta(w_x)^2+s^3\Theta^3\left(\frac{x-x_0}{a}\right)^2 w^2\right)e^{2s\gamma}\,dxdt\\
&\le C\int_0^T\int_\omega v^2e^{2s\gamma}dxdt + C\int_0^T\int_{\tilde\omega}e^{2s\gamma}(v^2+(v_x)^2)dxdt\\
&\le C\int_0^T\int_\omega v^2e^{2s\gamma}dxdt + C\int_0^T\int_I v^2\frac{1}{a}dxdt \le C\int_0^T\int_\omega v^2\frac{1}{a}dxdt,
\end{aligned}$$

for a positive constant C. The rest of the proof is similar to the last part of the first case of Lemma 6.1. □

Thanks to Lemma 6.3 we have the next observability inequality in the case of a regular final–time datum:

Lemma 6.4. *Assume Hypotheses* 6.2. *Then there exists a positive constant* C_T *such that every solution* $v \in \mathcal{W}_2$ *of* (6.6) *satisfies* (6.5).

The proof of the previous result follows as in [19, Lemma 5.5], but we can refer also to the proof of Lemma 6.2.

Using Lemma 6.4, one can prove, as in [8] or [9], Proposition 6.2.

7 Final comments

We conclude the paper with some comments about the estimates (4.4) and (5.3).

A Carleman estimate similar to (4.4) for the problem in divergence form can follow by [3, Theorem 4.1] at least in the strongly degenerate case and if the initial datum is more regular. Indeed, in this case, given $u_0 \in H^1_a(0,1)$, u is a solution of (1.2) if and only if the restrictions of u to $[0,x_0)$ and to $(x_0,1]$, $u_{|_{[0,x_0)}}$ and $u_{|_{(x_0,1]}}$, are solutions to

$$\begin{cases}
u_t - A_1u = h(t,x)\chi_\omega(x), & (t,x)\in(0,T)\times(0,x_0),\\
u(t,0)=(au_x)(t,x_0)=0, & t\in(0,T),\\
u(0,x)=u_0(x)_{|_{[0,x_0)}},
\end{cases}\tag{7.1}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} u_t - A_1 u = h(t,x)\chi_\omega(x), & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (x_0,1), \\ u(t,1) = (au_x)(t,x_0) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x)_{|(x_0,1]}, \end{cases} \tag{7.2}$$

respectively. This fact is implied by the characterization of the domain of A_1 given in Propositions 2.2 and by the Regularity Theorems 2.1 when the initial datum is more regular. On the other hand if u_0 is only of class $L^2(0,1)$, the solution is not sufficiently regular to verify the additional condition at (t,x_0) and this procedure cannot be pursued.

Moreover, in the weakly degenerate case, the lack of characterization of the domain of A_1 doesn't let us consider a decomposition of the system in two disjoint systems like (7.1) and (7.2), in order to apply the results of [3], not even in the case of a regular initial datum.

Even if the problem is in non divergence form and the initial data is more regular, the above decomposition doesn't work. Indeed in this case, using the characterization of the domain of A_2, one has that $(au_x)(t,x_0) = 0$ (this equality holds only in the strongly degenerate case, see Proposition 3.2). But, to our best knowledge, the only result on Carleman estimates in this field is for problems with *pure* Neumann boundary conditions, in the sense that $u_x(t,x_0) = 0$, and with *more regular degenerate functions* (see [17]), that we don't have in our hands.

References

[1] E.M. Ait Ben Hassi, F. Ammar Khodja, A. Hajjaj, L. Maniar, *Carleman estimates and null controllability of coupled degenerate systems*, Evol. Equ. Control Theory **2** (2013), 441–459.

[2] E. M. Ait Ben Hassi, F. Ammar Khodja, A. Hajjaj, L. Maniar, *Null controllability of degenerate parabolic cascade systems*, Port. Math. **68** (2011), 345–367.

[3] F. Alabau-Boussouira, P. Cannarsa, G. Fragnelli, *Carleman estimates for degenerate parabolic operators with applications to null controllability*, J. Evol. Equ. **6** (2006), 161-204.

[4] A. Bensoussan, G., Da Prato, M.C. Delfour, S.K. Mitter, *Representation and Control of Infinite Dimensional Systems*, Second edition. Systems and Control: Foundations and Applications. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2007.

[5] I. Boutaayamou, G. Fragnelli, L. Maniar, *Lipschitz stability for linear parabolic systems with interior degeneracy*, Electron. J. Diff. Equ. **2014** (2014), 1–26.

[6] H. Brezis, *Analyse fonctionnelle*, Collection of Applied Mathematics for the Master's Degree, Masson, Paris, 1983.

[7] P. Cannarsa, G. Fragnelli, *Null controllability of semilinear degenerate parabolic equations in bounded domains*, Electron. J. Differential Equations **2006** (2006), 1–20.

[8] P. Cannarsa, G. Fragnelli, D. Rocchetti, *Controllability results for a class of one-dimensional degenerate parabolic problems in nondivergence form*, J. Evol. Equ. **8** (2008), 583–616.

[9] P. Cannarsa, G. Fragnelli, D. Rocchetti, *Null controllability of degenerate parabolic operators with drift*, Netw. Heterog. Media **2** (2007), 693–713.

[10] P. Cannarsa, G. Fragnelli, J. Vancostenoble, *Regional controllability of semilinear degenerate parabolic equations in bounded domains*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **320** (2006), 804–818.

[11] P. Cannarsa, G. Fragnelli, J. Vancostenoble, *Linear degenerate parabolic equations in bounded domains: controllability and observability*, IFIP Int. Fed. Inf. Process. **202** (2006), 163–173, Springer, New York.

[12] T. Cazenave, A. Haraux, An Introduction to Semilinear Evolution Equations, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1998.

[13] L. Escauriaza, C.E. Kenig, G. Ponce, L. Vega, *Unique continuation for Schrödinger evolutions, with applications to profiles of concentration and traveling waves*, Comm. Math. Phys. **305** (2011), 487-512.

[14] E. Fernández-Cara, M. González-Burgos, S. Guerrero, J.-P. Puel, *Null controllability of the heat equation with boundary fourier conditions: the linear case*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **12** (2006), 442–465.

[15] E. Fernández-Cara, E. Zuazua, *Null and approximate controllability for weakly blowing up semilinear heat equations,* Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **17** (2000), 583–616.

[16] C. Flores, L. De Teresa, *Carleman estimates for degenerate parabolic equations with first order terms and applications*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **348** (2010), 391–396.

[17] G. Fragnelli, *Null controllability of degenerate parabolic equations in non divergence form via Carleman estimates*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S 6 (2013), 687–701.

[18] G. Fragnelli, D. Mugnai, *Carleman estimates and observability inequalities for parabolic equations with interior degeneracy*, Advances in Nonlinear Analysis **2**, (2013), 339–378.

[19] G. Fragnelli, D. Mugnai, *Carleman estimates, observability inequalities and null controllability for interior degenerate non smooth parabolic equations*, to appear in Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. ArXiv: 1508.04014.

[20] G. Fragnelli, G. Ruiz Goldstein, J.A. Goldstein, S. Romanelli, *Generators with interior degeneracy on spaces of L^2 type*, Electron. J. Differential Equations **2012** (2012), 1–30.

[21] J. Le Rousseau, G. Lebeau, *On carleman estimates for elliptic and parabolic operators. applications to unique continuation and control of parabolic equations*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **18** (2012), 712–747.

[22] M. Salo, L. Tzou, *Carleman estimates and inverse problems for Dirac operators*, Math. Ann. **344** (2009), 161–184.

[23] J. Vancostenoble, E. Zuazua, *Hardy inequalities, observability, and control for the wave and Schrödinger equations with singular potentials*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **41** (2009), 1508–1532.